ان الدين عند الله الاسلام

The Review of Religions

Edited by Ghulam Farid Malik, M. A.

Vol. XXXII MARCH, 1933 No. 3

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

CONTENTS

	Pages
ISLAM THE RELIGION OF PEACE ...	113
THE INTERNATIONAL SPIRIT OF ISLAM —Sirdar Ikbal Ali Shah ...	121
LABOUR *VERSUS* CAPITAL ...	127
UNTOUCHABILITY AND ISLAM ...	133
PLACE OF RELIGION IN A NATION'S LIFE —Late President Coolidge ...	139
WHO BURNT THE ALEXANDRIA LIBRARY—II —Mr. Muhammad Hussian, B. Com. ...	140
NOTES AND COMMENTS ...	146
Purpose of the Prophet's expeditions—Status of Woman in Christianity—A Christian defence of polygamy—The Clash of World Forces—Spook Crooks—Bernard Shaw on the Bible.	
NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN ...	153

Head Office: QADIAN, Punjab: India.

Branch Office: THE LONDON MOSQUE, 63, Melrose Road, Southfields, London, S. W. 18.

The Ahmadiyya Movement

THE Ahmadiyya Movement was founded by Hazrat Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi and the expected Messenger of all nations. In the spirit and power of all the earlier prophets he came to serve and reinterpret the final and eternal teachings laid down by God in the Holy Quran. The Movement therefore represents the true and real Islam and seeks to uplift humanity and establish peace throughout the world. Hazrat Ahmad died in 1908, and the present Head of the Movement is his second successor, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, under whose direction the Movement has established Missions in many parts of the world, the following being the addresses of some of them :—

(1) THE LONDON MOSQUE, 63, Melrose Road,
Southfields, London, S. W. 18, England.

(2) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM,
Sufi M. R. Bengalee, M.A.,
56 E, Congress St., Suite 1307,
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. America.

(3) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Commercial Road, Salt Pond,
Gold Coast, West Africa.

(4) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Rose Hill, Mauritius.

(5) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
25-27, Alof Street, Okepopo, Lagos,
Nigeria, W. Africa.

(6) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Box No. 305, G. P. O.
Perth, W. Australia.

(7) THE CENTRAL (E.A.) AHMADIYYA
MUSLIM ASSOCIATION,
P. O. Box No. 554, Nairobi
(Kenya Colony.)

(8) MAULVI ABUL 'ATA, Maulvi Fazil,
Sharial Burj, Haifa, Palestine.

(9) MAULVI RAHMAT ALI, Oetœsan Ahmadiah,
Defensielijn V/d Bosch, No. 139, Batavia Centrum, Java.

(10) MAULVI MOHD. SADIQ, H.A., Oetœsan Ahmadiah,.
Padang—(Sumatra)

The

Review of Religions

Vol. XXXII MARCH, 1933 No. 3

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم

نحمدہ ونصلی علی رسولہ الکریم

In the name of Allah, the most Beneficent and the most Merciful
We praise Him and invoke His blessings upon
His exalted Prophet.

" A prophet came unto the world and the world accepted him not, but God shall accept him and establish his truth with mighty signs."

ISLAM THE RELIGION OF PEACE

By Islam is known that riligious system which was preached to the world by the Holy Prophet Muhammad from the desert of Arabia in the beginning of the 7th Century of the Christian era. This system is commonly know in the West as Mohammadenism, a name quite unknown to the Moslems themselves. Islam, though presented in its most perfect form by the Prophet of Arabia (Peace be upon him) did by no means originate with him. It was the religion of all the Prophets of God from Adam up to Jesus Christ. It is as wide in its conception as humanity itself. In fact, any divine teaching that was given to any nation was Islam. But the teachings of the prophets before the Holy Prophet Muhammad being trammelled with the limitations of time and local circumstances were meant only for the peoples for whose spiritual growth and development they were revealed. Hence those teachings were not given any independent name. But

because the divine teaching that was given to the Holy Prophet Muhammad assimilated all that was imperishable in the teachings of all the prophets before him and because it was meant for all peoples and all time, therefore God gave it a distinct name, which is Islam. The Holy Quran says: "This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed my favour on you and chosen for you Islam as a religion." Again it says: "Verily the religion with God is Islam alone."

The word Islam indicates the very essence of the religious system known by that name. Its primary significance is the "making of peace," and the idea of peace is the dominant idea in Islam. Islam stands for peace between man and his Creator, between man and his fellow beings, between different religions and communities. Peace is the greeting of one Muslim to another and "Peace" shall also be the greeting of those in Paradise. "The Author of peace" is one of the many names of God mentioned in the Holy Quran and the "Abode of Peace" is the destination and the spiritual goal of humanity. It is only natural that a religion which claims to be the Last Divine Message for mankind should offer us some basis on which inter-religious, inter-national and inter-communal peace could be established permanently and without any fear of being disturbed.

The enormities, the most monstrous crimes that man has committed against man, have been perpetrated in the fair name of religion. Innocent and honest men have been burned at the stake, stoned to death, buried alive, drowned in the sea, in the name of religion. Nations have fought against nations to impose their own religious beliefs on their opponents. To stamp out Budhism, the holy fathers of the so-called peaceful Hinduism sanctioned the wearing of arms against the heretics. The Romans, instigated by the Jews, subjected the Christians to every persecution known to man. The storm of savage fanaticism which in the annals of Christendom is called "The Holy Wars," swept over Western Asia to serve the cause of Christianity. The Muslims have also carried fire and sword, but never in the name of religion. Islam has ever respected

the freedom of conscience. "Let religion only be for the sake of God" and "Let there be no compulsion in religion," are the express commandments of the Holy Quran. The Muslims are strictly enjoined to respect and protect the places of worship of the followers of other religions, even at the cost of their own lives. The Quran says: "And had there not been God's repelling some people by others, certainly there would have been pulled down cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques in which God's name is much remembered."

The inclusion by Islam of the belief in the divine origin of all religions and the acceptance of their founders as Messengers of God, in its fundamental doctrines, is the most important and practical step that Islam has taken to remove feelings of bitterness and animosity among the followers of various faiths and to create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill among them. That the great religions of the world are one in origin and many in form is a truth now widely recognised, but when Islam made its appearance in the world that truth was quite unknown. It was from the desert of Arabia and from the mouth of the man who could not even read and write that the great truth was promulgated that God was the Lord, not of a particular tribe or particular nations, but of all nations, nay of all the worlds. The God whom Islam requires us to worship is the Lord of all peoples, of all ages and all countries.

He has been equally Merciful and Beneficent to all nations. If He raised Muhammad from Arabia, He raised Moses from Egypt, and Jesus from Judea; Zoroaster from Iran, and Buddha and Krishna from India. These Prophets were the propagators and disseminators of the same fundamental truths, though their teachings differed in their quality and scope. Hence Islam recognised the truth that all these teachers of humanity were God's great Messengers and it was made incumbent upon a Muslim to believe in them as he believes in Muhammad. Ransack the pages of all religious scriptures and you will not find this teaching in them. A Christian may look upon Muhammad as an imposter, and a Jew regard Jesus as a false Prophet, and a Hindu who believes in the finality of the Vedic revelation may

consider Moses a charlatan, but a Muslim ceases to remain a Muslim the instant he ceases to revere any one of them as he reveres the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). Consistently with these teachings, how can a Muslim adversely criticise Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism and Hinduism when he regards the Old and the New Testament in their original form, the Vedas and the Zend Avesta in their pristine purity as the revealed Word of God. Does not this great principle of Islam strike at the very root of all religious rancour? The Holy Quran says: "There is no nation but a Prophet has appeared in it," and "Verily we have sent apostles before thee—of them are some We have mentioned to thee and there are others We have not mentioned to thee." According to these verses all great Prophets of God are the spiritual ancestors of a Muslim and their followers his brothers in faith.

Peace Between Labour and Capital.

The other great problem which is seriously undermining the peace of the world, is the discontent prevailing in the working class against the capitalists. Islam claiming to bring about harmony and peace among warring interests has not failed to solve this baffling question also. On the one hand it recognises private ownership because there is no spirit of competition and incentive to progress left without the recognition of this fact, because if those who work harder than others or can bring a superior intellect or higher business capacity into the conduct of their affairs are to be deprived of the just rewards of their labour, all this competition and striving after better results would cease and the world would come to a standstill. On the other, Islam recognises on principle the right of the poor in the wealth of the rich. The Quran says: "In the wealth of the rich, those who can and who cannot ask have a right." Islam suggests three remedies to remove the vast disparities of wealth and poverty. Firstly, it enjoins the distribution of inheritance. No man has the power to bequeath the whole of his property to one man, so as to promote its accumulation in a few hands. Under the Islamic Law of

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

inheritance and succession a man's property must be distributed among his parents, all his children, his widows, brothers, sisters, etc., and nobody can interfere with or divert this mode of distribution.

Secondly, Islam prohibits the giving and taking of interest. The possibility of being able to raise loans on interest enables people with established credit to enhance it to any extent they please by borrowing. The huge trusts and syndicates which at present monopolise the sources of the national wealth, would not be possible without interest, and wealth would be more evenly distributed among the people.

Thirdly, the institution of *Zakat*. *Zakat* is a tax of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. levied by the Government on all money, precious metals, and merchandise, etc., which a person has been in possession of for one year or over. It is not only a tax on income, but is a tax both on income and capital, and in many instances may amount to near 50 per cent. of the net profit. The proceeds of this tax are applied to supply those people with capital who possess the necessary business capacity, but who are unable to make a start owing to want of funds. By this institution of *Zakat* Islam provides for the discharge of all those rights that the poor have in the wealth of the rich, and thus brings about a reconciliation between labour and capital.

International Peace

The third problem which is destroying the peace of the world is the unsatisfactory condition of the international relations. For the settlement of international disputes Islam lays down rules which contemplate a body like the present League of Nations. The Quran says : " If two Muslim nations fall out, make peace between them. But if one of them, nevertheless, attacks the other, then all must fight the former, till it submits to the command of God, and when it so submits, make peace between them, and act with justice and equity, for God loves the just. " This verse lays down the following principle for the maintenance of international peace.

As soon as there are indications of disagreement between two nations, the other nations instead of taking sides with one or the other of them should at once serve a notice upon them to submit their differences to the League of Nations for settlement. But if one of them refuses to submit to the League, or having submitted refuses to accept the award of the League, and prepares to make war, the other nations should all fight it. It is apparent, however, that one nation, however strong, cannot withstand the united forces of all other nations and is bound to make a speedy submission.

Peace between the rulers and the ruled

The strained relations of the rulers and the ruled is another factor which is disturbing the world's peace. Islam does not acknowledge any form of Government other than a representative Government. The Holy Quran has used the word *Amanat* (trust) in describing the Islamic conception of Government. It does not speak of the right of government as something proceeding from the sovereign to the subject, but as something proceeding from the subject to the sovereign.

For a full appreciation, however, of the Islamic conception of the State, it is necessary to quote the verse, which in brief but comprehensive terms describes the nature and duties of the rulers and the ruled. The Holy Quran says : " God commands you to entrust the responsibility of government to those worthy of it, and those of you who become rulers should rule justly ; God admonishes you with that which is excellent, verily He is Hearing, Seeing." According to this verse, government is a trust, and not in the nature of property and the rulers are required to rule justly, and another verse, " Obey God and the Apostle and those who are in authority among you, " enjoins all men to obey those who are in authority over them and thus cuts at the root of all kinds of rebellion and anarchy.

Peace in the Family

By recognising the social status of woman and securing her rights in inheritance, in the guardianship of the children, in the

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

mangement of the affairs of the family, in worship, in short, in Church and State, Islam has established the peace in family on a firm basis. If men have rights over women, women according to the Quarn, likewise, have rights over men. According to Islam, woman is the keystone of the arch of family life, and unity in family is essential to a progressive state. Let it not be forgotten that of all religions Islam alone has accorded woman a status which after 13 centuries of progressive development working with the legacy of a prior civilization under the most favourable circumstances, the most civilized country in the world has not given her. By raising her from the condition of a mere chattel in which she was held before the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and giving her her right place in society, Islam 1,300 years ago settled those knotty family problems which in the present progressive state of woman have wrecked many homes.

Peace among Individuals

Islam has laid down detailed injunctions which regulate the relations of individuals towards one another. "God commandeth you," says the Quran, "to do justice, beneficence and kindness to kith and kin." In this verse God has set forth three injunctions. The first step is the step of Justice. A Muslim is enjoined to discharge his duty and obligations quite faithfully and honestly and in the best way he can. No violation of the rights of others is permitted. When Justice becomes to him a matter of course, he is required to do more than mere Justice. He should be beneficent to others. When beneficence begins to appear to him not a very high stage of morals, he should be kind to his fellow people as a mother is kind to her son.

The first stage of morals is of doing good in proportion to the good received; the second stage is of doing more good than the good received; and the third and the highest stage of morals consists in doing good to others, not in return of a good received, nor in doing more good than the good received, but in doing good as prompted by natural impulse without the

expectation of any reward or even any appreciation or acknowledgment.

Nothing seems more ironical than that the religion of which the very name signifies peace, which stands for freedom of conscience, which has enjoined upon its followers to respect the religious beliefs of other peoples and to protect their places of worship even at the risk of their own lives, a religion which has struck at the very root of religious acrimony by requiring its followers to believe in the missions of all the Prophets of God and in the divine origin of their teachings, a religion which has laid down teachings which if fully acted upon would bring about an era of per etual peace, should be looked upon as a religion breathing war and preaching hatred and a religion propagated at the point of the sword. But such really is the prevailing view about Islam. Let there remain no doubt about it that Islam positively forbids the use of force for the propagation of its teachings.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

THE INTERNATIONAL SPIRIT OF ISLAM

(By Sirdar Ikbal Ali Shah.)

The existence of the Islamic religion as a practical medium for humanist and international relationship and development has not received the consideration it merits. The world's thinkers and publicists have failed to recognize those of its tenets which trend toward international and fraternal relationships and profess to see in it nothing more than an antiquated system of theism and rigid legal dogma having no tendency whatever to modern ideas of internationalism. Yet Islam was the first code actually to profess the brotherhood of man, and it still remains one of the most potent forces possible for achieving this great ideal in a practical manner, were it employed for the purpose.

Even at its inception the Islamic faith expressed its civilizing and fraternal sentiments by checking the pagan licentiousness of the pre-Islamic Arabs, and altering the tribal habits of the vice-ridden, warring and scattered clans of Arabia. Muhammad was, indeed, pre-eminently a practical prophet, who inculcated in his followers a profound feeling for peace, nor are any of the compaigns in which they were subsequently engaged traceable to his personal influence. He made war on none, and on numerous occasions expressed abhorrence of armed strife. So it is both inaccurate and misleading to state that the Islamic faith was spread by the sword or by conquest. Any wars in which its religionists were engaged during the lifetime of the Prophet were deliberately forced upon them for sectarian purposes, as a faithful study of history reveals.

The cardinal spirit of the Prophet's mission was that he was the first great religious leader to preach the equality of man. He laid it down that all Muslims were brothers before the eyes of Allah, with no distinction of rank or wealth. Nor is race any barrier to absolute religious equality among Muslims.

Indeed the primary and lasting power of the Prophet's mission is that he led men out of the narrow grooves of tribalism and nationalism to the wider vistas of internationalism, which he regarded as a powerful instrument for world peace. What it has taken the Christian West nearly two thousand years to recognise, as evinced in one degree or another by the ideal of the League of Nations or the Communism of Russia, was expressed by Islam more than thirteen hundred years ago and practised in the maintenance of peace between the Islamic peoples.

Any man, no matter of what racial origin, who becomes a Muslim at once breaks down the racial barriers betwixt himself and all other Muslims. Whether he be a Chinese, a negro, an Indian, an Afghan or an Arab, he is no longer regarded by his brother Muslims as a member of that race, but as a Muslim pure and simple. It was, indeed, this specifically human appeal which Muhammad regarded as among the most powerful civilizing agencies associated with his ideal.

Nor has personal rank or social condition any sanction in the Muslim world so far as religious equality is concerned. In the mosque a beggar and a king may stand at prayer in the same row without offence. The house of prayer is free to all at any time, and is sacrosanct in that a man may take refuge there without fear of being injured by his enemy within its precincts. Moreover, in the Islamic Church, one does not pay for accommodation, as in other religious bodies. Religion in Islam is regarded as the free right of all, and is maintained by the offerings of the pious according to their own abilities.

The equality of man, therefore, was established for the first time in the history of humanity by the preaching of Islam, the tenets of which, by reference to its writings, may be discovered as enshrining the noblest ideal of human fraternalism ever excogitated or expressed—a fraternalism as practical in action as it is beautiful in essence.

Is it not then possible for the world to discern in Islam an agency for the furtherance of that spirit of International amity

which is the one hope of humanity? Is it not eloquent of that very essence of Internationalism which good men of all races perceive must be the grand human aim if peace and prosperity are to be achieved at last in a weary and strife-sodden world? To seek for such a spirit in the writings of Islam is to discover expressions of the most lofty international ideals on nearly every page.

Who can be in doubt that a perverted sense of nationalism must in the end lead its protagonists to war? Nationalism unchecked is as much a disease as a violent fever which ends in mental instability; it is an intoxication rushing through the national bloodstream which cannot but eventuate in collision with some neighbouring community similarly afflicted with racial pride.

But from the beginning Islam was regarded, not only by its founder, but by his contemporaries, as a new democracy which held out hope of international accord to all the races of the world. That it has been stigmatized as a code propagated and upheld by the sword is a profound misreading of history. The wars of the Muslims were inspired almost wholly by the necessity for self-preservation, and had they not thus defended themselves they would speedily have been decimated by relentless enemies.

But Muhammad's ideal of internationalism was founded on the basis that nations, like individuals, must recognize a standard of responsibility and honour. There cannot, indeed, be one standard for the individual and another for the nation, for as individuals go to compose a nation, so nations compose humanity, and their obligations to one another cannot differ in essence from those laid down for the proper performance of the personal code of good faith.

The spirit of Islam is, in a word, opposed to racial or national isolation and exclusiveness. No creed so well or so charitably insists upon the principle of racial equality. "Islam," says Hallam, "offered its religion, but never enforced it; and

the acceptance of that religion conferred co-equal rights with the conquering body, and emancipated the vanquished States from the conditions which every conqueror, since the world existed, up to the period of Muhammad, had invariably imposed."

Wherever there was Muslim conquest a mild and pacific rule assuredly followed. In Spain the native races were governed with liberality and goodwill, were permitted to retain their own religion and in many cases to administer their own laws. The enlightened rule of the Islamic Moors in the peninsula is perhaps the best illustration of the truth that the Muslim code is the most tolerant among the world's legal institutions, and is therefore the best fitted to encourage that spirit of internationalism for which mankind so pathetically longs.

The present position of the world reveals that nationalism, so far from being a beneficent influence, is a very mixed good indeed. More than ever since the Great War have national propensities been exacerbated and aggravated, and international hatreds incurred. The utter failure of religion to cope with an orgulous racial or national outlook is proven to all men.

When it is recalled that something more than mere good-feeling and lip-service is essential to a better international standard, when it is remembered that the modern institutions, which are based on the principle of mere international brotherhood, have egregiously failed of its purpose, it becomes manifest that something more spiritual than mere fraternalism is essential if the gulfs which separate nations and races are ever to be bridged.

For international fraternalism must have a spiritual sanction to be successful in its aims, and this sentiment is nowhere better revealed than in the traditions and writings of the Muslim world, which lays peculiar stress upon the brotherhood of man and supplies the necessary religious and altruistic precepts for its successful application.

Just as Islam makes the way plain for good relationships between individuals, so does it outline the methods by which nations or races can enter into bonds of world-wide fraternity. Indeed, that which it posits regarding personal amity is to be regarded as having also international implications.

The first note of international accord struck by the Prophet is to be found in the charter which he granted to the Jews and the message he sent to the Christians of Najran. The latter runs as followed :

> "To the Christians of Najran and the neighbouring territories, the security of God and the pledge of His Prophet are extended for their lives, their religion, and their property —to the present as well as the absent and others besides ; there shall be no interference with the practice of their faith or their observances; nor any change in their rights or privileges ; no bishop shall be removed from his bishopric ; nor any monk from his monastery, nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy everything great and small as heretofore ; no image or cross shall be destroyed ; they shall not oppress or be oppressed ; they shall not practise the rights of blood-vengeance as in the days of Ignorance ; no tithes shall be levied from them, nor shall they be required to furnish provisions for the troops."

Nowhere in Muslim territory have non-Muslim subjects been precluded from building new places of worship, unless in districts exclusively inhabited by Muslims. Indeed in the reign of Mamun there were no less than eleven thousand Christian churches in Muslim lands, while Christians, Jews and representatives of other Faiths were included in his Council of Government. After the conquest of Egypt, the Caliph Omar preserved intact the property of the Christian Churches and continued the allowances made by the former Government for the support of the priests.

Illustrations, indeed, abound that wherever the faith of Islam is to be found the feeling of internationalism is strong. So long as the central doctrine of the Unity of God is

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

recognised and accepted there is general equality in the eye of the law, which in itself is a code simple but capable of the greatest development, flexible, and based on a just appreciation of human rights and duty.

Ancient Muslim law stands in sharp contradistinction to that of Feudalism, not only as regards its paternal spirit, but in the latitude it allowed in the relationships between peoples. The Feudal system nourished a narrow nationalism, which even descended into tribalism on occasion, which viewed its neighbours with a jealous eye and existed on warfare. And just as nationalism in modern times, in far too many instances, is Chauvinistic in spirit and prone to the retention of deep gulfs between the peoples of the world, so is Islam inspired by a freedom of intercourse among the peoples. Throughout the Muslim world the son of Islam may travel unquestioned, assured of brotherhood and hospitality wherever his affair may take him. Is not this the spirit of the true internationalism, and can the world to-day exhibit any parallel with the free and generous intercourse by which Islam has already established a bond among its peoples which no other faith has so far been able to establish? Those who desire to see the world-wide acceptance of a fraternal internationalism, might well direct their closest attention to the methods, by which the code and principles of the Prophet, established it long ago in those lands where it still remains unbroken in its purpose.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

LABOUR *VERSUS* CAPITAL

Of all the movements that are at work undermining the peace of the world, the most extensive in its influence and effects is, perhaps, the movement of the masses against the classes. The deep root of this social discontent against the capitalist class in all countries is to be found in an economic system, which according to the protagonists of the cause of Labour, fails to provide for the masses the conditions of a healthy, intellectual and civilized life, or to give them a fair share in the advantages of progress. They argue that the wide disparities of wealth and poverty, the uncertainty of work and the mechanical drudgery of much of the work, offend all ideas of social justice. We would not endeavour to repudiate or vindicate the claims and grievances of the capitalists or the workers against each other, but would only confine ourselves to an impartial statement of the viewpoints of both so that our youngmen may have a true appreciation of this, one of the most momentous and baffling of all modern problems.

The Socialist indictment of the capitalist system of industry and the society based upon it, has four main counts. History proves that, whilst national poverty may have other causes, whenever and wherever the greater part of the population are divorced from the ownership of the instruments of production, even where the aggregate production is relatively enormous, the bulk of the people live in penury, and large numbers of them are perpetually threatened by starvation. In the second place, this penury and its accompanying insecurity are rendered more hideous and humiliating by the relative comfort and luxury of the proprietary class, and by the shameless idleness of some of its members. The worst circumstance of capitalism is, however, neither the poverty of the wage earner nor the luxury of the property owner, but, thirdly, the glaring inequality in personal freedom between the propertyless man and the member of the class that " lives by owning." Hour by hour, day by day, year

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

in and year out, the two-third of the nation who depend for their daily or weekly housekeeping, on gaining access to the instruments of production find themselves working under the orders of the relatively restricted class of those who own these instruments. The sanction for the orders is not legal punishment, but, ultimately, a starvation which is supposed to be optional. That is what is meant by the wage-earners when they complain of "wage-slavery." Fourthly, the Socialist believes that the very basis of the capitalist system is scientifically unsound, as a means of organising the production and distribution of commodities and services, and fundamentally inconsistent with the spiritual advancement of the race.*

To put in more concrete form, the Socialists contend:

(1) That in the capitalist system of society, those who own the most, not those who work the most, get, in fact, the largest incomes.

(2) That the ownership of land and capital by private individuals, coupled with the legal institution of inheritance, is bound to result in a division of the community into two permanent and largely hereditary castes—a nation of the rich and a nation of the poor.

(3) That the evil effects of this gross inequality between the incomes of individuals and of classes are an altogether inefficient consumption of the commodities and services annually available for the nation's maintenance; the encouragement of parasitic idleness; and consequent on these, a widespread lack of good manners and a constantly operating dysgenic influence on the race.

(4) That the man and woman who consumes without personally contributing to the world in the production of services and commodities is a social parasite or even a thief, by depriving labour of all that labour creates.

* *Decay of Capitalist Civilisation* by Mr. Sidney Webb (Lord Passfield).

(5) That the habitual respect and deference given to men and women who are wealthy, merely because of their wealth—irrespective of goodwill, personal charm, or artistic or intellectual achievements—is not only as damaging to those who are thus respected and deferred to, as it is to those who pay homage to riches, but it actually obstructs the recognition, and therefore the imitation, of the qualities of character and intellect that are in themselves admirable.

(6) That in pursuit of the limitless natural wealth of new and slightly-peopled lands the profit-maker destroys natural resources. Hence fur-bearing and food animals are killed, primeval forests are levelled to the ground, natural pastures are denuded, virgin soils are defertilised, coal and metals, oils and gases – all reserves of potential power—are wasted and exhausted ; the rivers are dried up, and the very climate is impaired.

(7) That tremendously great is the power which capitalism gives to the propertied class. Not only that the capitalists hold the lives of the labourers in their hands, being in possession of the means of their existence, but that private wealth is seen very largely to control, by its dominion over the newspaper press, the mental environment of the whole population ; and by its power in this and various other ways even to nullify universal suffrage, and dangerously to influence, in the interests of private gain, the executive government and the legislation of every advanced industrial community.

(8) That capitalism is responsible for all wars and consequently responsible for the bloodshed and misery that follow in their wake. All territorial rivalries, all diplomatic quarrels, are at bottom nothing but the competitive struggles of rival traders and militarism could not have achieved a fraction of its destructive power if capitalism had not provided the machinery and weapons.

(9) That though incalculably grave is the indictment of capitalism as constituting the underlying cause of war between nations, yet more continuous and universal, and therefore

probably more potent in its effects on society, is the class war which the capitalist organisation of industry, with profit-making motive, has gradually created in every advanced industrial community.

(10) That the unearned increment which the capitalist gets by investing surplus capital, and which sometimes totals up to colossal figures, encourages idleness, speculation, financial jugglery, and is chiefly responsible for poverty, pauperism, unrest and other social diseases of the body politic.

(11) That whatever may be thought as to the indispensability of the motive of profit-making, no one ventures to assert that it is a high motive or a noble aspiration.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Hence Socialism proposes to make such of the means of production into public property as can be conveniently and advantageously owned and controlled by the community. . . . If private enterprise can carry on any productive works or conduct any public service better than the community can do it, a Socialist State might certainly be trusted to encourage that form of enterprise which would bring the best results to the community. . . . But whatever private production or voluntary enterprise does exist in the Socialist State will not be private capitalism. Capitalism means capital employed for the purpose of appropriating profit or surplus value. There can be no Socialist State in which the exploitation of labour for the profit of others is allowed. There can be no Socialist State where economic rent is appropriated by monopolists. The reason why Socialists aim at the control and ownership of land and capital is because, generally speaking, that is the only way in which rent, interest and profit can be secured for the community, and also because, generally speaking, the community can work a concern or public service more economically and efficiently than private enterprise can do it.*

* Lord Snowden.

The capitalists retort :

(1) That the happiness of the community depends on its wealth ; the wealth of the nation depends on maintaining and increasing its annual product ; the best way of doing this is by letting each citizen make himself as rich as he can in his own way ; the quickest way to personal riches is profit-making in a free market ; hence unrestricted profit-making by individual capitalists is the best way of securing the welfare and happiness of the nation.

(2) That labour in the sense of manual, by itself can effect nothing. Put down the most skilful handworker on a bare piece of ground and he cannot produce anything out of it until he has made himself tools and so become a capitalist himself.

(3) That capitalism has vastly increased the productive power of mankind by making use of the resources of thousands of individuals voluntarily subscribing their money in the hope of profit which can only be earned if the consuming public will voluntarily buy the goods and services produced. Thus this system is based on freedom—the freedom of the subscriber in risking his money, and the freedom of the consumer in giving or withholding his custom and the profit that it makes possible, *i.e.*, it is based on competition, individual effort, individual responsibility and individual choice.

(4) That if hereditary property were abolished, and the consequence were that no one cared to earn more than he wanted to consume, the fund, out of which new railways are built, new factories and ships are placed at the disposal of industry and commerce, would be very seriously diminished.

(5) That science could never have wrought its miracles if there had not been a vast store of accumulated wealth to apply to the development of its discoveries.

To the demand of State socialism in preference to the private ownership of the important industries and services the capitalists say : Is it possible that such a system could work at all ;

whether, in fact, the ordinary human being, as he is to-day, would be prepared to work at the bidding of the State, on conditions laid down by the State, with anything like the enthusiasm and readiness with which people work nowadays with the prospect of securing profit and advantage to themselves? Would the more stirring spirits in the community who think they can see their way to fortune in present circumstances, if they work for it with determination, put anything like the same vigour into work that they did for the State ; and it is upon the energy and readiness to take risks of this comparatively small body of stirring spirits in the community that economic progress really depends. If we stifle the incentives which now spur them to take risks and try experiments in the hope of fresh opportunities of profit, there is grave danger not only that the economic progress of the community might be checked, but that its whole economic organisation might fall into decay and slothfulness, and that any attempt to improve or expand might be met with the same cold and unreceptive stare that now usually greets any new suggestion that comes up before officials of Government departments. Moreover, if the decision as to what is to be produced is to be in the hands of a Governmental committee, as under State Socialism, or of a guild or trade union committee, as it would apparently be under guild Socialism, then it is perhaps possible, though highly doubtful, that the objects on which the productive enterprise of the community would be exercised might be more sensible and tasteful, because the general members of the community having no power of choice, would not be exercising sense of good taste, but would merely be taking, whether they liked them or not, goods and services provided by the decision of an outside body. Hence the contention of the capitalists that Socialism is not a constructive theory, but an expression of dissatisfaction.

UNTOUCHABILITY AND ISLAM

The impact of the new ideas and ideals that are busy reshaping the world's social order on a new basis have awakened the suppressed communities and interests all the world over to a consciousness of the importance of their place in human society and consequently to the betterment and amileoration of their condition and status. Even the depressed classes among the Hindus, perhaps the most hide-bound and conservative people on the face of the globe, have had their share of this world-wide awakening. They have begun to realize, though that realization is vague, incomplete and indefinite, that after all they are not so hopeless and helpless as they have so long regarded themselves and can regain with a courageous and sustained effort the rights of which they have been so callously and unjustly deprived by the Hindus. Mr. Gandhi, a shrewd judge of men and matters, saw with his usual penetrative foresight that unless the Hindus moved very fast in according to the so-called "untouchables", at least some of their social and political rights, they will drift out of the fold of Hinduism to which they have so far owed, verbal if not real, allegiance. The Premier's Award gave him a rude shock and he persuaded himself to believe that the Award had sought to thrust a wedge between the "untouchables" and the high class Hindus. His 'fast unto death' against the grant to the Depressed Classes of the representation of their interests by their trusted and accredited spokesmen from among their own community, stirred Hindu conscience to its inmost depths. And since then the question of untouchability has overshadowed all other questions in India. Mr. Gandhi's first concern is to throw open the doors of the Hindu temples to the 'untouchables'. Whether he really believes that by handling and solving, first of all, the spiritual side of the question of untouchability, he will more easily, effectively and in a shorter time be able to solve its social and political aspects or he merely seeks to lull back the Harijans, as he affectionately calls the untouchables, into the deep sleep of ages from which they seem to be awakening, by assuring them with his present Temple-entry campaign that they need have no fear as regards their social and political rights, we do not know.

The leaders of the Depressed Classes themselves are inclined to the latter belief and they look upon Mr. Gandhi's present activities as a political manœuvre.

Whether Mr. Gandhi will succeed in getting the doors of Hindu Temples thrown open to the 'untouchables', time alone will tell. But even if he does succeed, his success will not satisfy the 'untouchables'. The disabilities from which the 'untouchables' have suffered for centuries and are still badly suffering are social. They do not care whether they are allowed worship in Hindu temples or not. It would not benefit them to any appreciable extent if their present social degraded condition remains the same as it is now. Dr. Ambedkar, their acknowledged and recognised leader has kept no secret as to what he considers about the temple entry question and Mr. Ranga Iyer's Temple Entry Bill. Like a courageous man, full of self-respect, he has contemtuously refused to accept charity from Mr. Ranga Iyer's or even from Mr. Gandhi's hands. "I do not care whether my people are allowed inside the Hindu temples or not," the brave Doctor has saidt o the Hindu leaders. "Give them higher education, higher employment and better ways of earning and living, and the question of entering the temples will become solved itself." To understand properly the attitude of the Depressed Classes towards Mr. Gandhi's activities about the temple entry question and to realize fully also what are the real demands of the 'untouchables' and what feelings are agitating their minds, it is relevant and quite necessary to give, *in extenso*, Dr. Ambedkar's recently published view on this question. He is reported to have said :

> To prevent any misunderstanding, I would like to elaborate the point by drawing a distinction between social evils which are the results of secular causes and social evils which are founded upon the doctrines of religion. Social evils can have no justification whatsoever in a civilized society. But nothing can be more odious and vile than that admitted social evils should be sought to be justified on the ground of religion. The Depressed Classes may not be able to overthrow iniquities to which they are being subjected. But they have made up their mind not to tolerate a religion that will lend its support to the continuance of these iniquities. If the Hindu religion is to be their religion then it must become a religion of social equality.
>
> The mere amendment of Hindu religious code by the mere

inclusion in it of a provision to permit Temple Entry for all cannot make it a religion of equality of social status. All that it can do is to recognize them as nationals and not aliens, if I may use those terms which have become so familiar in politics. But that cannot mean that they would thereby reach a position where they would be free and equal without being above or below any one else for the simple reason that the Hindu religion does not recognize the principle of equality of social status, on the other hand fosters inequality by insisting upon grading people as Brahmins, Kashtriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras which now stand towards one another in an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

If the Hindu religion is to be a religion of social equality then an amendment of its code to provide Temple Entry is not enough. What is required is to purge it of the doctrine of *Chaturvarna*. That is the root cause of all inequality and also the parent of the caste system and untouchability which are merely forms of inequality. Unless it is done, not only will the Depressed Classes reject Temple Entry, they will also reject the Hindu faith. *Chaturvarna* and the caste system are incompatible with the self-respect of the Depressed Classes So long as it continues to be the cardinal doctrine, the Depressed Classes must continue to be looked upon as low. For the Depressed Classes to say that they are Hindus is to admit their inferiority of status by their own mouth. They can call themselves Hindus only when the theory of *Chaturvarna* and caste system is abandoned and expunged from the *Shastras*. Do Mahatma Gandhi and the Hindu reformers accept this as their goal and will they show the courage to work for it ? I shall look forward to their pronouncements on this issue as I have stated it with great concern.

But whether Mahatma Gandhi and the Hindus are prepared for this or not, let it be known once for all that nothing short of this will satisfy the Depressed Classes and make them accept Temple Entry. To accept Temple Entry and be content with it, is to temporize with evil and barter away the sacredness of human personality that dwells in them.

There is, however, one argument which Mahatma Gandhi and the reforming Hindus may advance against the position I have taken. They may say 'acceptance by the Depressed Classes of Temple Entry now will not prevent them from agitation hereafter for the abolition of *Chaturvarna* and caste.' If that is their goal, I like to meet this argument right at this stage with a view to clinch the issue and clear the road for future developments. My reply is that it is true that my right to agitate for the abolition of *Chaturvarna* and caste system will not be lost, if I accept Temple Entry now. But the question is on what side will Mahatma Gandhi be at the time when the question is put ? If he will be in the camp of my opponents, I

must tell him that I cannot be in his camp now. If he will be in my camp, he ought to be in it now.

What the Depressed Classes want isa religion which will give them equality of social status. The mere amendment of the Hindu religious code by the mere inclusion in it of a provision to permit Temple Entry for all cannot make it a religion of equality of social status. What is required is to purge it of the doctrine of *Chaturvarna*.

Mr. Gandhi has, unequivocally and emphatically, refused to be in Dr. Ambedkar's camp. Dr. Ambedkar wants the advancement of the social status of the Depressed Classes. He demands that Hinduism be purged of the doctrine of *chaturvarna* which is at the root of all inequality and also the parent of the caste system and untouchability. Mr. Gandhi defends *chaturvarna* and says that it will continue to be a creed and principle of the Hindu faith. Dr. Ambedkar wants a religion which will give the Depressed Classes equality of social status. Mr. Gandhi is a Hindu of Hindus, not because he is born of Hindu parents but by conviction and because Hinduism 'gives him all solace' and Hinduism cannot give up the doctrine of *chaturvarna*, because according to the Shastras it forms an integral part of the basic beliefs and principles of Hinduism.* So evidently Mr. Gandhi

---

*Manu says :—1. " A Sudra commits no sin by eating the prohibited articles of fare, he can not be initiated with the thread, he is not priviledged to institute Vedic sacrifices, he is precluded from doing the *Paka-Yajnas.*" (10 : 126)

2. " He (the Brahmana) must not give any worldly advice, or the leaving of his food or the residue of the fire-offering to a Sudra ; let him not give religious instruction to a Sudra, nor grant him sanction to practice a vow.

3. " The Brahmana who gives religious instruction to a Sudra or who advises him to practice a religious vow is drowned with that Sudra in the hell of *Asamvritam.*" (4 : 80, 81.)

4. " Even set at liberty by his master, a Sudra cannot be liberated from service ; service is his vocation by nature ; who shall emancipate him from that ?" (8 : 413, 414.)

5. " Serving the Brahmanas forms the *summon bonum* of Sudra's life ; whatever he does is futile." (10 : 123.)

cannot give him what Dr. Ambedkar wants, and Hinduism cannot give him equality of social status with the caste Hindus.

But let not Dr. Ambedkar be down-cast. Let him not lose heart. There is a religion which will give him equality of status, socially and spiritually, that he so passionately desires. That religion is Islam, the religion of peace and of the equality of social and spiritual status for all men. Islam has openly and unequivocally recognised the right of all men to be born with no stigma of inferiority of any kind. Islam is the most democratic, we should not hesitate to say, the only truly democratic, religion. It refuses to accept all superiorities which are only the result of the accident of birth.

---

6. "If a Sudra uses any offensive language to a member of the twiceborn caste, his tongue hall be clipped off, inasmuch as he has originated from a vile place."

7. "If a Sudra abuses a member of the twice-born order by mentioning his name and caste, a burning tong to the length of ten fingers shall be inserted into his mouth."

8. "If a Sudra insolently gives any religious or moral advice to a Brahmana, the king shall cause hot oil to be poured into his mouth and ears." (1 : 270, 271, 272.)

9. "The name of a Brahmana shall be a term of blissful import, that of a Kshatriya shall be one denoting strength, that of a Vaishya shall be one connected with a term denoting wealth, and the name of a Sudra shall be a term implying vileness." (2 : 31.)

10. "A Sudra, whether a slave purchased or otherwise must be employed in service, inasmuch as it is for serving the Brahmana that he has been created by the self-begotten one."

11. "For having sexually visited a woman of any twice-born caste, whether protected or unprotected by her husband, a Sudra shall be punished with the mutilation of his reproductive organ and confiscation of all his goods and estates in the first named instance, and in the last named case, he shall pay the penalty with his life." (8 : 374.)

12. "A Sudra cannot sit on the same seat with a man of superior caste. If a vile person attempts to sit on the same seat or cushion with a man of superior caste, the king shall punish him by branding his waist and exiling him from the country, or by lopping off his hips." (8 : 281.)

Islam knows no caste-system, no doctrine of *chaturvarna*. It recognizes only one way by which a man can become worthy of the respect of others—service and sacrifice. "The one worthy of real respect in God's eyes is he who does the most righteous deeds," says the Quran. Let Dr. Ambedkar once enter the fold of Islam and he will see what endless vistas of social and spiritual advancement this greatest of all religions opens to him. The most depressed of the Depressed Classes will enjoy a social status, in no way inferior, to the mightiest Muslim Monarch.

PLACE OF RELIGION IN A NATION'S LIFE

"I do not know of any source of more power other than that which comes from religion.

"I do not know of any adequate support for our form of government except that which comes from religion.

"If there are any general failures in the enforcement of the law, it is because there have first been general failures in the disposition to observe the law.

"I can conceive of no adequate remedy for the evils which beset society except through the influences of religion.

"There is no form of education that will not fail, there is no form of government that will not fail, there is no form of reward which will not fail.

"Redemption must come through sacrifice, and sacrifice is the essence of religion.

"It will be of untold benefit if there is a broader comprehension of this principle by the public and a continued preaching of this crusade by the clergy.

"Without that faith all that we have of an enlightened civilization can not endure."

—The Late President Coolidge.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

WHO BURNT THE ALEXANDRIA LIBRARY—II

[By Mr. Muhammad Hussain, B. Com.]

In my previous contribution under the above heading, I have tried to prove that the origin of the stupendous charge against Hazrat Omar is unhistorical. It is the unbounded bigotry and blind prejudice of the Christian writers, which has raised a toppling structure on a flimsy basis of an unauthenticated story. In the light of cold facts of history, it is false as house of cards and crazy as gossamer. I want, however, to push the point further and dissect that supposed skeleton in the cupboard.

Abul Fragin's story, which has been breathlessly grasped by our critics, is a contradiction in terms. The notorious author of it is guilty of glaring inconsistency, which dubs his story a rank lie. Amr, he writes, was sagacious, intelligent and thoughtful and took fancy for John the Grammarian, because of his vast learning, and that he was so fond of his philosophical discussion that he always kept him in his company. Anybody with a grain of commonsense, can conceive that a lover of learning, as Abul Fragin says Amr was, is incapable of perpetrating such a monstrous act as the burning of a library. The story stands condemned by the very words of its author who was able enough to recognize the merits of Amr. But unconsciously, as inevitably occurs in false fabrications, laid the axe at the root of his own story.

Perhaps our opponents might argue that Amr did all that under the pressing command of Hazrat Omar. But they would only betray their gross ignorance of the prominent facts of history. In matters controversial history is the final court of appeal and we must turn to it even in the present case. Every student of history knows that Hazrat Omar was against Amr's leading an expedition against Alexandria but Amr was sure of his victory and it was on his own responsibility that he was allowed to proceed.

Bilazree tells that he was so eager that he did not even wait for the final sanction of the Caliph, and went ahead. Again it is an established fact that in all matters concerning the drafting of Pact with Egypt Amr was allowed full and free rope by the Caliph, who set his seal when it was an accomplished fact. It is past comprehension that Amr whose opinions and suggestions carried such weight with the Caliph could have supinely submitted to such a monstrous order which is unjustly attributed to Hazrat Omar.

There is one thing more which takes the wind out of the sails of our critics and proves the innocence of the Caliph. It is the letter which Amr wrote to Hazrat Omar, in which there is no mention of the burning of the alleged library. The words of the letter are " I have captured a city of which I can but say that it contains 4,000 palaces, 4,000 baths, 40,000 tributary Jews, 400 theatres and 12,000 vegetable gardens." The mention of the Library is conspicuous by its absence. A profound lover of learning as Amr was, he could not fail to mention so gigantic a Library as was supposed to exist at the time of his invasion. The fact is that there was no library worth the name.

At the Bar of Reason

Historical facts alone, are sufficient to dissipate the clouds of misrepresentations against Hazrat Omar. But we can not afford to give the go by to reason which is persistently vocal on the point of controversy. It unavoidably steps in when history is sought to be blurred by a mud-slinging critic or when desperate attempts are made to take shelter behind the improvised and made up screen of volatile folk-lore. Astute and adroit minds can play fast and loose even at the bar of reason, and not unfrequently they save their faces by their superior logic but it is impracticable, though not impossible, to utilise logic-chopping with advantage in a matter which concerns a man whose whole life is an open book. Hazrat Omar is a great historical character. His every act is a proven fact of history. Logic, however, ingenius and insidious can not throw dust in the eyes of those who know

and read his life story, which is replete with instances of unique tolerance and fearless humanitarianism. His is no obscure personality to fall an easy victim to the overlaying of partisan historians. Hence we can approach the bar of reason without the haunting dread of its pranks. On the contrary, in cases as this reason is more illuminating than history itself.

It is alleged that Caliph Omar ordered the burning of the Alexandria Library because it contained books which were at variance with the declared doctrines of Islam. But the allegation is as weak as can be. If the Caliph's bigoted mentality could be the prime cause of that alleged conflagration, it could also have displayed itself nearer home, in the burning of the sacred books of Jews and Christians who were the vassals of the Muslims. These people were against Islam and they based all their opposition on their sacred books. Could Omar, if he had been as dark as he is painted to be, not make short work of these books and remove one great obstacle in his path ? But he always stayed his hand and never indulged in the acts ascribed to him. Acts of violence and vandalism were against his doctrines. How could he, in the face of an open injunction *i.e.*, "seek knowledge even though it may be in China," dare issue a command whose observance was a sin against God and crime against humanity. Throughout his life he was noted for his condescending graciousness to *Zimmis* (non-Muslim subjects. The terms of treaties of capitulation were never stringent. Nothing intolerable was imposed, nothing was extorted except a legitimate levy, in return for which the conquered people were given peace and protection. The treaty of capitulation made with the Egyptian people is quoted in Ibn Khaldoon. Under the terms of that treaty the inhabitants were guranteed security of life and property in return for a mild poll-tax which was in range with the prosperity or otherwise of their agricultural pursuits. What treaty can be more favourable! What being can be more gracious.

If Omar was as wild and barbarian as to consign to flames all books at variance with Islamic doctrines, our

Christian critics ought to have given some example from some European countries, not a few of which came under the sway of Islam. Did those countries not contain any library "worth burning"?

The period of Muslim supremacy was the Augustan age of light and learning. The store of world's knowledge was enriched by the translation of books on science, medicines and Greek philosophy. Could the destroyers of Alexandria Library accomplish epoch-making feats of learning? If Hazrat Omar had burnt the Alexandria Library, it would have gone down in history as a cue for his successors to carry flames wherever they went, and denude the countries of their abodes of learning. But did any Muslim ruler behave like that? Could Muslim Caliphs and Monarchs who always look to Omar for lead and light, have missed this act of his, if it had the least truth? The storm of Muslim conquest Spread in India. The followers of the Holy Prophet (Peace and blessings of God be upom him!) reigned and ruled over the "land of the Rishis". But not one leaf of any sacred book was desecrated, much less burnt.

Our Christian critics, who have no scruples in dipping their gall when writing about Muslims, deliberately slur over long list of outrageous conflagrations whose flames engulfed not only the receptacles of learning, but human beings also. There are instances aglow of the burning of books and men. People of glass-houses have no right to throw stones at others. How would our opponents account for the following appaling incidents which sprang from sheer prejudice:—

(1) When Wycliffe—the well-known morning star of Reformation—first rendered the Bible into English in 1526, he incurred the wrath of Roman Catholics. Not only was his translation proscribed and burnt but his bones were exhumed from his grave and burnt (Walton Vol. 3rd printed and published in 1871.) His followers known as Lollards were also consigned to flames. What tragedies could that people not perpetrate who had no hesitation to wreak

vengeance on the relics of one of their own flesh and blood merely for religious differences.

2. Rowland Taylor, Vicar of Hadleigh, was condemned to the stake and suffered death, because he refused to renounce Protestantism.

(3) William Tyndale tempted fortune by conceiving a strong desire of translating the Bible into English. He was latterly joined by Miles Coverdale in a translation of the Old Testament. But they only completed Pentateuch and the book of Jonah. Their work, even their lives were cut short by the orders of Cardinals and Bishops, who called them heretics tampering with religion. It was announced far and wide that some followers of Luther had misinterpreted the Bible and that everybody possessing a copy of their translation was commanded to hand it over to General Whittaker on pain of exclusion from Church.

The English version of the New Testament, which Tyndale completed with the help of Luther, was just published in Antwerp. But it found its way into England, where it was publicly burnt at St. Paul's Cross by Sir Thomas Moore the well known author of 'Utopia'. The author was also put to death by strangling and burning. When again in 1530, Tyndale's translation was revised and published, the Bishop of London traced out the publisher and imposed a huge fine on him.

(4) Again, in 1546, Henry VIII issued royal orders proscribing the Translations by Tyndale and Coverdale, and prohibiting by an Act of Parliament the reading of Wycliffe's and Firth's writings. The people were commanded to hand over these proscribed writings to the Church to be burnt.

(5) Christian "broadmindedness and tolerance" found full display in the burning of the Book of Prayer in 1554.

(6) In 1555, orders were issued prohibiting the possession of heterodox books.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The above selection is adequate to drive the nail home. But it is incomprehensible that Christian writers should turn a blind eye to these hair-raising dramas enacted by the religious malice of their forbears. Would it not be proper for them to first clean their own doorsteps before pointing a finger of scorn at the nebulous flaws of others.

I cannot leave out of account the most ridiculous part of the charge of the alleged incendiarism. Notwithstanding its self-evident falsity, our opponents are never tired of repeating it in season and out of season. It is asserted that the books of the Alexandria Library were distributed among the baths and they continued to be used as fuel for six months Leaving the Arithmetical inaccuracies in the said calculation, one wonders if the critics do not feel ashamed of repeating a charge whose barefacedness needs no comment. It is a grotesque ignorance of the elementary facts of history. Books then were not written on paper (as they are today) but on vellum. Vellum was much in vogue in those days. Paper made of pulp is a modern invention. Even a dunce would not think of burning vellum, but our critics would. The very fact that vellum is incumbustible and that the books in those days were written on it, nails the whole lie to the counter.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Purpose of the Prophet's Expeditions

It is true that almost all the ten years of the Prophet's life at Medina were spent in fighting his wars of defence. It is equally true that he himself led armies to battle. But all the expeditions which he personally led or sent under the command of his distinguished companions were undertaken to serve one of the following objects and purposes, the central aim always being self-defence and self-protection:

1. To make pacts and alliances with the tribes which lived in the vicinity of Medina. If left to themselves these tribes would have proved a great source of danger to the Prophet, as being situated in his immediate neighbourhood they could be instigated by the Quresh of Mecca or the Jews and the Hypocrites in Medina to fall upon him at any time.

2. To loot the trading caravans of the Meccans, going to and coming back from Syria to Mecca. This was done to compel the Meccans to cease persecution of the Muslims and to come to terms with them. It should be remembered that those raids were made upon the caravans after a proper declaration of war was made and long after the Meccans themselves had made identical raids upon the Muslims and had often carried away their cattle, etc.

3. To collect and gather information about the movements of the enemy.

4. To anticipate a contemplated or an actually organised attack by the enemy.

5. To establish peace and order punitive expeditions were sent.

6. To protect and guard aganist possible attacks on Muslim missionaries and teachers, soldiers accompanied them.

7. To defend themselves against the attack of the enemy.

Who has the hardihood to say that any of these objects was ignoble. Is not self-defence or to die in defending one's rights, honour and country the greatest human virtue?

Leave alone visionaries and unpractical idealists whose ideals man can never live up to. The existence of individuals as much as that of communities, nations and races depends entirely on the measures they adopt for self-defence, self-protection, self-expression and even for self-assertion.

Status of Woman in Christianity

A certain class of Christian missionaries are never tired of accusing Islam of giving woman an inferior status in society and in the household than that of man. They seem to think that the mere repetition of a charge is enough to prove and substantiate it. We are not at present inclined to contradict this ostensibly foolish statement. It has been refuted and rebutted in the columns of this journal time and again. We want only to show from the writings of a very distinguished but dispassionate and impartial Christian sociologist that Christianity and not Islam is guilty of the charge of which the Christian missionaries accuse Islam. Dealing with the status accorded to woman by Christianity Dr. Adolf Heilborn writes in his book *The Opposite Sexes*:

> It cannot be said that in the first instance Christianity had much influence in raising the social position of woman. Influenced by the social conception of the Jewish race whence it originated at a time when political and commercial conditions were most intricate and susceptible to mythical undercurrents, it did not touch the critical question of polygamy so closely connected with domestic affairs. St. Augustine expressly condoned, or at least did not condemn, polygamy, and none of the Church Councils of the first Christian century prohibited

it as a sin. The Christian religion in general placed little value on woman, as may be realized on recalling the disdainful words used by St. Paul in regard to women and marriage, in his letters to the Corinthians. And one may remember those loveless and unfilial words of Jesus himself, addressed to his mother, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee,? Not to mention the obscence expressions of later Fathers of the Church, who saw in the woman merely an impure being, a vehicle for sinful lust.

Will our Christian friends take care that they remove the beam of their own eye before taunting their opponent of a fancied mote in his eye.

A Christian Defence of Polygamy

By allowing man, says the Christian missionary, to marry more than one wife under any circumstances, Islam has degraded woman. A Muslim has no need to defend his faith on this account. The social problems of Christian Europe have opened its eyes to the soundness and indispensibility of the institution of polygamy. Its foremost thinkers have openly admitted that in order to save itself from sinking deep into the quagmire of sexual immorality Europe shall have some day to practise polygamy. Let us quote Dr. Heilborn on this point also. He writes in the book quoted above :-

" Prostitution, in any form, is, as I have already said, thoroughly natural, and therefore, an inevitable consequence of monogamy. It is not dependent solely on the sex impulses of the normal man, but also on the unsatisfied desires of mature woman, when sufficiently strong restraining influences are not present. *This factor is of course, more potent when the number of women in a community largely exceeds that of men.*"

The Clash of World Forces

In his beautiful little book, *The Clash of World Forces*, Mr. Basil Mathew gives a remarkable survey of the forces that are fighting for the mastery of the world in the new order that

is fast coming into being. The clash of the titanic forces of nationalism, Bolshevism, and the mechanistic materialism, he says, has created a world crisis. Into that arena all of us—no matter to what race or nation or class we belong, or in what continent or island, we live—are irresistibly drawn. From the consequences of this clash, whether disastrous or glorious, none of our children will escape. The momentum of this clash is breaking every existing frame in which man has tried to set his life. The family, the nation, the state; parliament, trade unions, chambers of commerce, international law, empire—every single category of human life is not simply challenged, but dissolving and reshaping under our eyes. It is a crisis in the life of systems of society. It is, in an even deeper and more resolutionary sense, a crisis in the individual lives of men and women of every race.

After describing in clear, lucid and vivid words how the barque of humanity is being scourged by tempestuous nationalist and racial passion and how the cross-swell of Bolshevism makes man's existing civilization—Asiatic as well as European and American—reel, Mr. Basil Mattew gives his own impression of the impact of these titanic forces that are beating upon humanity. He believes that men everywhere peer into the turmoil of this turbulent human scene in search of some sign from which the future of our race may be divined. Those who look deeper still, he thinks, are asking the supreme question—Is there anywhere a master-word that can guide humanity? Has any prophetic voice—whether of scientist or master-organiser, statesman or philosopher, theologian or poet—a message to give us? Are there anywhere the engineer's "blue prints" of a new world order? These questions are being asked not by the philosopher only, or by the statesman, but in discussions in the railway train, the club, the public house, by the fire-side. They are debated by wireless. They fill the world with their clamour. Are they to remain unanswered? And then Mr. Mathew proceeds to supply the answer himself. He says that the barque of humanity is sure to founder and sink unless man is prepared to put it in the hands of a Navigator who sails by the fixed stars of eternal values and whose grasp on the

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

wheel no gale can conquer. We quite agree with Mr. Mathew that the social, economic, moral and spiritual ills from which humanity is suffering have assumed such proportions that statesmen, poets, philosophers cannot solve them. Mr. Mathew thinks and believes that Jesus alone can save mankind and we believe only Muhammad can and he *will*. Jesus has not the powers and the capacity to solve humanity's present baffling problems. He was given an opportunity to solve the social and moral problems of a small community about 1900 years ago. He failed to solved them. Muhammad was raised among a people economically, morally and spiritually as good as dead. He put in them a new life. He changed the face of an entire continent. He evolved a new order. He gave to the world a new concept of God's attributes and succeeded in fully eradicating from among those communities and nations that believed in him and followed his teachings the false notions based on the invidious distinctions of caste, colour and creed. Among Muslim communities the economic problem, as it exists to-day, has always been conspicuous by its absence. Islam believes in no narrow and confined nationalism. The mental horizon of the Muslims even in these times of their all-round decay, transcends and expands beyond all barriers of country and nation. The present problems that are undermining the peace of the world are the product of a civilization which is beyond doubt and dispute based on Christian ethics and morality. Christianity has failed to bring balm to humanity's lacerated heart. Jesus never was a world teacher and he can never guide humanity's barque to the haven of safety. In Islam will the world find its salvation as Arabia did 1,400 years ago. And the Navigator who sails by the fixed stars of eternal values and whose grasp on the wheel no gale can conquer has already come. He is Muhammad's lieutenant and vicegerent, the Prophet Ahmad of Qadian, India.

Spook Crooks

Just as the world war gave rise to many economic and social problems that still await solution, it brought in its wake as many religious problems. One of its aftermaths was an increased belief in spiritualism. Mothers and fathers desiring " messages " from their sons who were killed in the war gave

a great fillip to this unnatural creed and at one time it became so popular that men of such outstanding learning and unimpeachable character as Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Conan Doyle were carried off their feet and began actually to believe that communication could be effected with, and " messages " received from, the ' spirits ' beyond the grave. Unemployment also drove thousands to fortune-tellers. Though it received very great moral support from the association with it of the above two gentlemen, the creed being unnatural, unconvincing and unsupported by the incontestible facts of daily life stood upon a broken reed. It has succeeded, however, in attracting a large number of swindlers, fakers, spook crooks and fraudulent astrologers who trade on the gullibility, superstition and credibility of the public. According to authentic statistics in America alone through their uncanny, weird tricks these contemptible mountbanks and charlatans compared to whom the bearded, cone-hatted diviners of the Middle Ages were bungling amateurs, catch about 30,000,000 people a year, and take $125,000,000 away from them. In return for this comfortable livelihoood they ruin many of their unfortunate victims, cause the suicide of others, even drive some of them insane. It is, indeed, very heartening to find that a strong and vigorous movement is now on foot against the wicked and fraudulent practices of these ' spiritualists ' and we are sure the days of this creed which is a disgrace to true religion and which took its birth in the superstition and credulity of old mothers, are numbered. It has been dinned into our ears in season and out of season by a host of western writers that the eastern people being uneducated are easily prone to be superstitious. We have had the privilege, during a fairly long stay in the West, to come in contact with a very large number of western peoples belonging to all grades and strata of society and we can say on the basis of our personal observation and experience that superstition is not a special badge of the unlettered and uneducated East. It is a commodity which is found in greater abundance and in a more heinous form in the civilized and cultured West. We hope to review in our next issue, *Spook Crooks*, a recently published book in which the

tricks of fortune tellers and fake spirit mediums that cause suicide, dishonour, poverty ; that make the " black magic " of medieval ages seem like " child's play," are explained and illustrated in detail by Mr. Julien J. Proskaur, Chairman of Press Committee and a Trustee, Parent Assembly, Number One of the Society of American Magicians.

Bernard Shaw on the Bible

We give below for the benefit of our readers Mr. Bernard Shaw's opinion about the Bible. Not that we believe that all that Bernard Shaw says carries weight – in fact he is a past master in talking humbug and nonsense – but because he is generally believed to be a great thinker we consider it worth while to record his opinion about the Bible, especially for the perusal of these who find a special zest in finding fault with the Quran, in season and out of season. Mr. Shaw says :

" A great deal of it is much more alive than this morning's paper and last night's parliamentary debate. Its chornicles are better reading than most of our fashionable histories, and less intentionally mendacious.

"In revolutionary invective and Utopian aspiration it cuts the ground from under the feet of Ruskin, Carlyle, and Karl Marx ; and in epics of great leaders and great rascals it makes Homer seem superficial and Shakespeare unbalanced."

" But to understand and appreciate the Bible, we must cease to look on it as one book about one God, and we must cease to believe most, or a great deal, of what it contains. For example :

" As to Bible science, it has over the nineteenth-century materialistic fashion in biology the advantage of being a science of life and not an attempt to substitute physics and chemistry for it ; but it is hopelssly pre-evolutionary ; its descriptions of the origin of life and morals are obviously fairy-tales ; its astronomy is terracentric ; its notions of the starry universe are childish ; its history is epical and legendary : in short, people whose education in these departments is derived from the Bible are so absurdly misinformed as to be unfit for public employment, parental responsibility, or the franchise."

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN

وقلنا يا آدم اسكن انت وزوجك الجنة وكلا منها رغدا حيث شئتما ولا تقربا هذه الشجرة فتكونا من الظالمين۔

36. Wa qulnā ya Adamus-kun anta wa zaujukal jannata wakulā minhā raghadan haithu shi'tumā walā taqrabā hādhi-hish-shajarata fa-takúnā minaz-zālimīn.

36. And we said : " O Adam dwell thou and thy wife in the garden, and eat ye therefrom plentifully where-ever you please, but approach not this tree, lest you be of those who are unjust to themselves.

49 (*a*) جنة *jannat* (garden) means 'a place over-shadowed by trees.' (*Vide* note 39*a*). Hence a garden or a place overgrown with trees is called a *jannat*. The place where believers will be made to abide after death is also called *jannat*, because the believers will dwell under shady trees, and divine mercy will also overshadow them. But it should be noticed that the locality where Adam was ordered to live is not the one where the believing souls will go after death ; for, as we are told in Ch. XV, 49, no believer is expelled from the abode of bliss after he has once been admitted into it. But we see that Adam had to quit the place where he was first made to dwell, which shows that it must have been some beautiful spot here on the earth, and verse 31 of this chapter also supports this view. Recent researches go to show that the garden of Eden where Adam was made to dwell lay near Babylon.

(*b*) According to the Bible, the forbidden *shajarah* (tree) was the tree of knowledge. But we learn from the Holy Qur-ān that Adam and Eve became naked, after having eaten of the forbidden fruit, that is to say, the tree was a source of evil which made Adam exhibit a weakness,

The Quranic view is evidently correct, because to deprive man of knowledge was to defeat the very purpose for which he was brought into being. The Holy Qur-ān and the Bible seem, however, to agree on the point that the tree was not a real one, but it symbolised something else, because no tree with either of the above characteristics exists on the face of the globe. So the tree represents some other thing.

In the Holy Qurān, the word *shajarah* is also used to mean a 'quarrel' as in the verse:—

فلا وربک لا یؤمنون حتی یحکموک فی ماشجر بینهم (نساء)

"But by thy Lord, they shall not be believers, never, until they make thee judge of what they disagree upon (or what is in dispute between them) (*fī mā shajara baina hum*) (IV, 66.)

Again, elsewhere the Holy Qur-ān makes mention of two kinds of *Shajarah*: one شجرہ طیبہ (good tree) and the other شجرہ خبیثہ (evil tree) (*vide* XIV, 25 and 27). The pure teachings are likened to the former, and impure things and impure thoughts are compared to the latter. In the light of these Quaranic explanations, the verse means, (1) that Adam was enjoined to avoid *quarrels*; (2) that Adam was warned against evil things, because although the verse does not specify evil or good *Shajarah*, yet the prohibition cannot but refer to impure things and evil thoughts.

(*c*) The Arabic word ظالم *ẓālim* is derived from ظلم *ẓulm* which means (1) putting a thing in the wrong place or in a place not its own, (2) to make one suffer loss, (3) transgression or tyranny. (Lane's Lexicon, p. 1920). Here when a command is first mentioned and the word *ẓulm* is used to signify its breach, the first of the three meanings seems to be appropriate. The phrase would thus mean that the result of approaching the *Shajarah* would be that he (Adam) would become, one of those who do not observe h e propriety of time and place in their actions.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

فازلهما الشيطن عنها فاخرجهما مما كانا فيه وقلنا اهبطوا بعضكم لبعض عدو ولكم فى الارض مستقر ومتاع الى حين

37. *Fa-azalla-humash-shaitānu 'anhā fa-akhrajahumā mimmā kānā fī-he wa qul-nahbeṭū, ba'ḍu kum li-ba'ḍin 'aduww wala-kum fil-arḍ mustaqarrun-wa matā'un ilā ḥīn.*

37. But Satan made them slip by means thereof, and so drove them from what they were in. And we said "Depart ye, some of you heing enemies of others, and for you there is an abode in the earth and a provision for a time."

50. (*a*) *'an hā* means 'by means of it.' Arabic عن *'an* =با *bā i. e.*, 'by means of.' Arabic ها *hā* (it) refers to *shajarah* (the tree). The first two clauses of the verse mean that a doomed being enticed Adam and his spouse away from the place where they were and thereby deprived them of the comforts they enjoyed. It must be noted that one who brought trouble on Adam is named *Shaiṭan* and not *Iblīs*. This distinction is to be found not only in the verse under discussion, but the Holy Qur-án invariably speaks of *Iblīs* while mentioning the incident of refusal to bow down through pride, and of *Shaiṭan* wherever mention is made of the instigation of Adam to eat of the *shajarah*. This distinction points to the conclusion that the word *Shaiṭan* does not here refer to *Iblīs*. The inference is further supported by the verse:—

(XVII, 66) ان عبادى ليس لك عليهم من سلطان (بنى اسرائيل)

"As to My servants, thou (*O Iblīs*) shalt certainly have no power over them."

As Adam was a vicegerent of God, *Iblīs* could have no power over him, and hence the being who put Adam to trouble was some one else. So, in order to bring out this fact, the word *Shaiṭan* which has a wider significance than *Iblīs* has been used here. According to the Holy Qur-án *Iblīs* is the name of the unclean soul that instils evil ideas into the minds of evil-doers as they grow in their wrong

doing, just as angels prompt virtue; whereas *Shaiṭan* is the name given to any being that has fallen away from the truth or is doomed to perish (*vide* note 29), be it *Iblīs*, some man or some other troublesome animal.

(*b*) The original اهبطوا *ihbiṭū* 'depart' signifies 'descend' or 'alight'. But when it is followed by the preposition من *min*, it means 'come forth', 'to depart', as هبط من الوادی *Habaṭa minal-wādī*. "He went forth from the valley." (*Abul Baqā*, p. 350.) But Arabic grammar permits of the preposition being omitted. Thus, the word اهبطوا *ihbiṭu* here could bear a duality of meaning: "put up", (2) 'depart'. Further on we read اهبطوا منها *ihbuṭi minhā* which signifies merely 'go out of it.' This clause explains the verse under discussion and substantiates the second meaning of اهبطوا *ihbiṭu*. Thus اهبطو ابعضكم لبعض عدو *ihbiṭu ba'ḍukum lī ba'ḍin 'aduww* means 'Depart ye, some of you being enemies of others.'

(*c*) The last clause of the verse under comment shows that the Holy Qur-ān lends no support to the idea of any body going to heavens alive. It clearly fixes the earth as the life-long abode of man. Thus the Holy Qur-ān does not support those who allege that Jesus ascended to heavens alive.

فتلقى آدم من ربه كلمت فتاب عليه انه هو التواب الرحيم

38. Fa-talaqqā Adamu mir Rabbi-hī kalimātin fa-taba 'alaih, inna-hū huwat-Tauwābur Rahīm.

38. Then Adam learnt from his Lord certain words, and He turned to him with mercy; He is indeed the Compassionate, the Merciful.

51. The Holy Qur-ān tells us that when *Shaiṭan* deceived Adam, and God informed him of his mistake, he prayed to God for forgiveness in these words:

ربنا ظلمنا انفسنا وان لم تغفرلنا وترحمنا لنكونن من الخاسرين (اعراف)

"O our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and unless Thou forgive us and have mercy on us, we shall surely be of the lost." (VII, 24.)

This was the prayer that he learnt from God. His prayer was heard and he was forgiven. The fact that God taught Adam the words of the prayer quoted above show that he was a recipient of divine revelation. In fact, man cannot, by force of intellect, know the will of God as certainly as when He Himself reveals it. Only that prayer leads most to success which is taught by God Himself.

قلنا اهبطوا منها جميعا فاما يا تينكم منى هدى فمن تبع هداى فلا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون

39. Qulnah-biṭū minhā jamī'a; fa-immā ya'tiyanna-kum-minnī hudan, fa-man tabi'a hudāya fa-lā khaufun 'alaihim; wa lā kum yaḥzanún.

39. And we said; 'Depart ye all hence; and if guidance comes to you from Me, then whoso shall follow My guidance, on them shall come no fear nor shall they grieve.

52. This verse holds out the promise that among the descendants of Adam there will continue to appear great souls who will invite people to truth and guidance, and those who will follow such holy ones will enter paradise even in this world, *i.e.*, their hearts will be so filled with faith that they will enjoy tranquility of mind in all circumstances. No fear about future failures or regret about past losses will trouble them and thus their hearts will be to them a paradise. The Arabic word خوف *khauf* denotes fear about the future, while حزن *ḥuzn* signifies regret for the past and fear of the future.

والذين كفروا وكذبوا بآيتنا اولئك اصحب النار هم فيها خلدون

40. Wal-ladhīna kafarū wa kadhdhabū bi-āyātinā ulā'ika aṣḥābun nār hum fīha khalidūn.

40. But they who disbelieve and treat our signs as lies, these are the inmates of the fire, wherein they shall abide.

53 (*a*) Those who will set aside the guidance of God will fall into a fire and will never enjoy inward happiness, and satisfaction of mind, however rich and wealthy they may happen to be. In the next world too, both those who will follow the guidance and those who will reject it will have the reward and retribuion of their deeds.

(*b*) The last clause of the verse *viz.* هم فيها خالدون *hum fī hā khālidūn*, " wherein they shall abide", does not here mean that they will remain in hell for ever. Islam does not believe in the eternity of hell, but looks upon it as a hospital where men will be sent for cure. The God of Islam is not vindictive, and does not delight in inflicting punishment on His creatures, but, on the other hand, His punishment is intended for the reformation of the creatures themselves. Neither the inflictions of this world nor those of the next are meant to satisfy His desire for revenge, but both here and hereafter, the underlying purpose of punishment is to heal and cure, so that when this purpose will have been fulfilled, punishment will be unnecessary. Accordingly, Islam gives us to understand that there will come a time when all the dwellers of hell will leave it for paradise.

As to our meaning of خلود *khulūd*, 'to abide long,' we refer the reader to the *kullivāt* of Abul Baqā, p. 165, in which he writes :—

فى الاصل الثبات المديد دام ام لم يدم

i. e., it means " staying for a long period and not necessarily for ever." Also see Lane's Lexicon, pp.783, 784.

يبنى اسرا ئيل اذكروا نعمتى التى انعمت عليكم واوفوا بعهدى اوف بعهدكم وايای فار هبون

41. Yā Banī Isrā' īladḥkurú ni'mati-yallaṭī an'amtu alai-kum, wa aufú bi'ahdī, úfi bi-'ahdi-kum, waiyyaāya far-habún.

41. O ye children of Israel, remember My blessing which I blessed you with, and fulfil your covenant with Me, that I may fulfil My covenant with you, and Me alone do ye fear.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

RUKU' V.

54. (*a*) In the previous Ruku', the Holy Qur-án, referring to Adam, draws the reader's attention to the fact that when Adam received revelation in the beginning, he met with opposition at the hands of enemy, and had consequently to leave his home. Hence, if Muhammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him !) has also had to leave his home, it is not a thing to wonder at.

Here arises a question. When revelation had been sent down in the beginning, what need was there to repeat it ? The Holy Qur-án answers this question by referring to a people who were present in the time of the Holy Prophet and to whom revelation had been given not long before his advent.

This address to the children of Israel serves also another purpose. If the last of the peoples who have been receiving revelations are shown to be in error, their predecessors also are thereby proved to have been in error, for the former being the last recipients of revelation could be presumed to have with them more of the amount of truth than the rest. Hence, the Holy Qur-ān, addressing these last people, says, " O ye children of Israel ! remember My blessing which I blessed you with ; *i. e.* you can by no means deny the need of fresh revelations, for you also have been favoured with this blessing. "

Elsewhere, the Holy Qur-ān says, " And *remember* when Moses said to his people, ' O my people, call to

mind Allah's blessing *which He bestowed* upon you when He appointed prophets among you and made you kings, and He gave you what He gave not to any *other* people *of that age*'" (V, 21.) This shows that by the word 'blessing' in the verse under discussion is meant the blessing which God bestowed upon the Israelites by raising prophets among them and making them kings. Thus, in the verse under discussion, God reminds them of the blessing of prophecy and tells them that as they are the last people among whom God raised prophets, therefore, they are more answerable to God than any other people.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

(*b*) "My covenant with you" means the covenant which God made with the Israelites. In order to know what that covenant was, we must turn to the Holy Qur-ān and the Bible. The former refers to this covenant in II, 125. When Abraham enquired of his Lord whether the promise which He had made to him applied to his posterity also, God said, "My covenant embraces not the transgressors," which means that the covenant applied to such of his children as weare righteous.

The Bible also refers to this covenant in Genesis XVII. After enumerating a number of promises which God made to Abraham, He says in *vv.* 13, 14: "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." First God gave certain commandments to Abraham and then promised to multiply his posterity and make him father of nations, and as a token of this covenant, He laid down that every male child must needs be circumcised, and that he who would break His covenant would be cut off from his people. Circumcision, in the scriptures, also stands for spiritual purification.

The Jews neglected spiritual purification, although performing the outward rite, while the Christians neglected both.

Again, this covenant extended to the generations that came after Abraham. We read in Deut. V that God gave some commandments to Moses and made a covenant with him. Thus *vv.* 2 and 3 say, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us who are all of us here alive this day." This idea has been repeated throughout the chapter, and it shows that the covenant which was made with Abraham was repeated with Moses.

Again, we learn from Exodus, XIX and XX, that when Moses brought forth his people out of the camp that they might hear the word of God, and they saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet and the mountain smoking, they removed, and stood afar off, and said to Moses, "Speak then with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die." (Gen. XIX, 17 and XX, 18—20) Thus they referred to listen to the word of God. In consequence of this, God deprived them of a great blessing. In Deut. XVIII, 15—19, we read :— "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken ; according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord, thy God, in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth ; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him."

In the foregoing verses, the Israelites are reminded of what they had said at Horeb, *viz.*, 'Let not God speak

unto us,' and they are told that as they themselves refused to listen to the word of God, "the Prophet" shall be raised not from among them, but from among their brethren. Prophets were raised after Moses, among the Israelites as the Holy Qur-ān itself testifies (*v.* 88), but the Prophet that was to be 'like' Moses, *i.e.*, a law-giving Prophet, was not raised from among them, in accordance with the prophecy quoted above.

The prophecy clearly stated that the next law-giving Prophet was to be from among the "brethren" of the Israelites. The Bible shows that the Ishmaelites were the "brethren" of the Israelites, and it was from among the former that the Holy Prophet of Islam appeared. That was the promise which was first made to Abraham and then to Moses.

It is wrong to say that the words "of the brethren" may refer to Israelites, for at the time of Moses all the tribes of Israel were living together, and if the promised Prophet was to appear from among them, it could not be right to say, that the Lord would raise up a Prophet "of thy brethren." Hence the prophecy cannot apply to Jesus who was an Israelite but was fulfilled in the Holy Prophet of Arabia who was an Ishmaelite. The words occurring in V. 18, "I will raise them a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee," confirm the conclusion that the words "from the midst of thee, of thy brethren," cannot refer to the Israelites.

If we take the words "from the midst of thee of thy brethren," as referring to them, the Israelites, then also these words may be applied to the Holy Prophet of Islam, for he, having been sent to all nations, may be said to have been raised from any one of them, for the Prophet who is sent to any people, in the terminology of sacred scriptures, is said to have been raised from among that people.

Now, the Israelites broke the covenant which God had made with them, and they broke it repeatedly, as has been pointed out in the Holy Qur-ān.

That covenant was then applied to the Holy Prophet of Islam, as the Holy Qur-ān says :

" So I will ordain it (my mercy) for those who act piously, and pay the poor-rate and those who believe in Our signs :—Those who follow the messenger, the Prophet, the Holy one whom they find written down with them in the Torah and the Gospel,".....(VII, 157, 156).

In these verses, God refers to another covenant which they find written down with them in the Torah and the Gospel," thus alluding to Deut. XVIII, wherein they are exhorted to accept him so that they may receive mercy.

Again, the Holy Qur-ān says, " And *remember* when Allah made a covenant with the Prophets, saying, ' surely, whatever I give you of the Book and wisdom, *and* then comes to you a Messenger, fulfilling *the revelation* which is with you, then shall you surely believe in him and help him,' and He said, ' Do you acknowledge it, and do you accept My covenant to that effect,' They said, ' We acknowledge.' He said, ' Then bear witness, and I too will be one of the witnesses with you.' "

This was the covenant which all the Prophets had been taking from their respective peoples.

It is alleged that the covenant of God as mentioned in the Bible refers to Isaac and his seed, and not to Ishmael, for he was the offspring of a handmaid. But the Bible refutes this idea in two ways. Firstly, the Bible tells us that God made promises concerning Ishmael, as He made promises concerning Isaac. For instance, we read in Genesis XVI, 10—12 :

" And the angel of the Lord said unto her (Hagar), I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be

numbered for multitude. And the Angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold, thou art with child, and shall bear a son, and shall call his name Ishmael; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man (it appears that 'Arab' has been translated as 'wild.'—*Translator*); his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." (*i.e.*, although all will oppose him, yet he will succeed.)

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Another evidence of Ishmael and his posterity being included in the covenant which God established between Himself and Abraham and his seed after him is furnished by Genesis XVII, 6—8 which says, "And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." But this land continued in the possession of Ishmaelites for 1300 years. If they were not the seed of Abraham, why did Canaan continue in their possession for so long a time?

Another evidence of Ishmael and his posterity being included in the covenant of God is furnished by Genesis, XV, where we read:

And Abram said, "Lord God, what will Thou give me, seeing, I go childless, and the steward of my house is Eliezer of Damascus? Behold, to me Thou hast given no seed: and lo, one born in my house is my heir." And behold, the word of the Lord came to him, saying, "This shall not be thine heir, but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir." And He brought him forth abroad and said, "Look toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them"; and He said unto him, "So shall thy seed be."

Now we see that the same promise was made to Hagar, *viz.* "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude." This shows that Ishmael was included in the covenant which God made with Abraham.

Another evidence of Ishmael being included in the covenant is that after the birth of Ishmael, God said to Abraham, "As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her (this shows that God had already given Abraham a son who was Ishmael, this promise being about Isaac :—*Translator*). Yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations ; kings of people shall be of her." (Gen. XVII, 15, 16.) The same promise was made to Hagar : "I will multiply thy seed exceedinly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude." (Gen. XVI, 10.)

In Gen. XVII *vv.* 17—20, we read :—"Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old ? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear ? and Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee ! (*i. e.* he might attain nearness to thee.—*Translator*) And God said, Sarah, thy wife, shall bear thee a son indeed ; and thou shalt call his name Isaac : and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant,—*and* with his seed after him.

"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee : Behold I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly ; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation."

The promises made for Ishmael in the foregoing passage are exactly the same as those made for Isaac ; nay, they are even greater in number, for, with regard to Ishmael, God says, 1. "I have blessed him." 2. "I will

make him fruitful." 3. "I will multiply him exceedingly." 4. "Twelve princes shall he beget." 5. "I will make him a great nation."

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Another evidence of the fact that Ishmael has not been treated as the son of a handmaid is furnished by the fact that circumcision which was instituted by God as a token of his everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed after him has been continued among the descendants of Ishmael. Though Islam also enjoined it, yet it was already in vogue among the Arabs. Now, the question is, why was this institution observed by the descendants of Ishmael? Ishmael was circumcised because he was a child of Abraham, but if his descendants constituted a separate nation, they ought not to have been circumcised. But this practice was continued among them, which shows that they too were looked upon as the seed of Abraham and were consequently included in the covenant of which circumcision was instituted as a symbol.

In order to exclude Ishmael from the covenant which God made with Abraham and his seed after him, the Christians bring forward the plea that the offspring of a handmaid is not included in the seed. But this is wrong; for in Genesis XXI, 13, it has been said, with reference to Ishmael:—"And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation because he is thy seed."

Now see how God deals with Ishmael who is spoken of as the son of a handmaid. We read in Gen. XXI, 14–19:—

"And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-Sheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot, for she said, Let me not see the death

of the child, and she sat over against him, and lift her voice and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad, and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, what aileth thee Hagar ? fear not ; for God has heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand ; for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water ; and she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad drink. And God was with the lad ; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer."

This shows that God rendered miraculous help to Ishmael, and brought into existence a well of water for his sabre. It is now for the Christians to show what extraordinary thing God wrought for Isaac that may be compared with this. In the above passage it is said that " God was with the lad," and he grew up under the special protection of the Lord.

Another evidence of the fact that Ishmael was looked upon as the seed of Abraham, on a par with Isaac, is furnished by the following circumstances :—

In Genesis XXV, 1—6, we read :—" And Abraham took another wife, and her name was Katurah. And she bare him Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishhak, and Shuab. And Jekshan begat Sheba, and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were Ashurim and Letushim, and Leummin. And the sons of Midian ; Ephah and Epher, and Hanoch, and Abida, and Eldaab. All these were the children of Keturah. And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abrahan had, Abraham gave gifts ; and he sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country.

The above passage shows that Abraham sent away all the sons of the concubines, keping with him only Isaac.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Ishmael was already away. In the next verses we read : " And these are days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, an hundred three score and fifteen years, and Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years ; and was gathered to his people. And Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machfelah. " (Gen. XXV, 7—9.)

Now, if Ishmael was also treated as the offspring of a concubine, he ought to have been treated in the same way in which the other children who were the issues of concubines were treated. But such was not the case. When Abraham died, Ishmael was summoned from Arabia (*vide* Gen. XXV) and Abraham was not buried until Ishmael arrived and participated in the burial ceremony with Isaac. Others, however, who were the sons of concubines and who were much nearer were not summoned on that occasion. This shows that Ishmael was not treated as the offspring of a concubine, but that he was looked upon as the equal of Isaac and was treated accordingly.

Hence in the words, " and fulfil your covenant with me, that I may fulfil my covenant with you," God reminds the children of Israel that He had made a covenant with Isaac and his seed after him to the effect that He would fulfil His promise to them if they kept the covenant and that if they did not keep it, He would raise the Prophet from among the children of Ishmael ; and that as they had failed to keep the covenant, He had raised the Prophet from among the Ishmaelites, and that henceforth the covenant was that he who would obey the Prophet should prosper, while he who would reject him should be cut off.

(*c*) وا یای فار هبون This sentence when fully expressed consists of three clauses ایای فارهبون انتبهوا فارهبون " Me do ye fear ; beware and me do ye fear."

IF . . .

YOU WANT TO KNOW

What Islam Stands for, what is its message for humanity, how does it seek to raise man from the lowest depths of degradation to the highest pinnacles of glory—economically, morally and spiritually

READ

AHMADIYYAT OR THE TRUE ISLAM

BY

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad

HEAD OF THE AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY AND THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORITY ON ISLAM

The book deals in a simple and lucid manner, briefly but fully and completely, with all the different aspects of the teachings of Islam.

BOOK DEPOT, QADIAN, Pb., India

Regd. No. L.-2942

— THE —

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(A MONTHLY JOURNAL)

OF SANE RELIGIOUS MUSLIM THOUGHT

DEVOTED TO

THE DIFFUSION AND DISSEMINATION

OF

THE BEAUTIES AND EXCELLENCES

OF

ISLAMIC TEACHING & TORCH-BEARER

OF

THE LIGHT OF ISLAM IN THE WEST.

Gives an Impartial Review of the Prominent Religions of the World and Removes Misconceptions about ISLAM.

Annual Subscription ... *Rs. 4*

All remittances should be sent to the MANAGER,

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS (English)

P. O. Qadian, Punjab (India)

Printed at the Ripon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore, by Mirza Mohd. Sadiq, and published by Sheikh Abdur Rahman Qadiani for Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Qadian, Punjab, India.